

**REMARKS**

New claims 19-36 have been added and claims 2-18 have been canceled. The Application now contains claims 1 and 19-36. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this application and in other applications.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1-10, 12-14 and 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Savitzky in view of Rautila. Claims 11, 15 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Savitzky in view of Rautila and van Rijn. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

The present invention relates to an information input/output system that allows a user of a first terminal to retrieve data from a second terminal, and more particularly to a system that ensures information security by allowing the user to output the data of the second terminal at an output device desired by the user only if the user is an authorized user of the first terminal. For instance, according to the present invention, the data, which for example has been obtained beforehand via a network or stored temporarily in a server, can be output at an arbitrary output device. As described at page 17, lines 19 to 21, "with regard to the security of the information, higher reliability can be ensured as compared to that of the conventional method."

The information input-output device according to claim 1 includes a service provision unit which has a database relating to services that can be provided to a subscriber, and "verifies whether a person trying to access the database is a subscriber who can be provided with the variety of services," and an input-output control unit which receives data from said service provision unit and outputs the data. Data in the database is read out through operation from said input-output control unit. An "authentication code is entered into said input-output control unit from which the data

is desired to be output, and when the person is authenticated by said service provision unit as a subscriber who can be provided with the service, said input-output control unit receives the data and then outputs the data.” Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references even when considered in combination fail to disclose, teach or suggest the limitations of claim 1.

For example, in contrast to the claimed invention, Savitzky teaches a Web agency allowing communications between a Web client and Web server. The Web agency is interposed between a Web client and a Web server to transform requests from the Web client prior to sending the requests on to the Web server (see Abstract). The Web client and the Web server are programmed to communicate with each other using a protocol such as HTTP (col. 5, lines 1-14). The Examiner acknowledges, at page 3 in the Office Action, that Savitzky fails to disclose anything about using an authentication code for the Web agency to connect to the Web server for security reasons.

To overcome this deficiency, the Office Action cites to Rautila as disclosing this feature. Rautila relates to a communication system including an information source (memory) 20, and a position transceiver 14 disposed at a broadcast location 16 and coupled to the information source 20 (see Abstract). The position transceiver 14 broadcasts information from the information source 20 within a broadcast area 18. The information includes identification information relating to the information source 20. The communication system also includes a mobile terminal 12 having first and second transceivers within the broadcast area, a network 42 communicating with the second transceiver, and a database 26 communicating with the network 42. The first transceiver communicates with the position transceiver 14. The database 26 transmits information associated with the identification information to the second transceiver when the database 26 receives at least the identification information transmitted from the mobile terminal 12 owned by the user via the network.

Rautila discloses (see col. 10, lines 7-8) that the user of the mobile terminal is allowed to access the database 26 after the user is confirmed to be an authorized user. This confirmation, however, involves checking a signature signed by the user with a secret key (col. 9, line 56 to col. 10, line 8), Rautila, even if considered in combination with Savitzky and/or van Rijn, fails to disclose, teach or suggest allowing the user to enter an identification code such as a secret number to determine whether the user is actually the authorized holder. Moreover Rautila, even if considered in combination with Savitzky and/or van Rijn, fails to disclose, teach or suggest allowing the user to output the data if the user is determined to be the authorized holder. Thus, contrary to the teachings of Rautila's secret key method, the claimed invention allows the user to more easily output the information while ensuring the security of the transaction.

Furthermore, the cited combination fails to disclose, teach or suggest an input/output controller, which is not owned by the user, that uses an authentication code to access the server. Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is allowable over the cited combinations.

Applicant further submits that it is improper to combine the references in the manner suggested by the Office Action. Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found in the references themselves. In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Even if Savitzky was "capable of being modified to run the way [the applicant's] apparatus is claimed," a point which is not conceded, there still "must be a suggestion or motivation in the reference to do so." See In re Mills, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ.2d (BNA) 1430, 1432 (Fed. Cir. 1990). There is no suggestion or motivation in any of the references for combining them to arrive at the claimed invention. In fact, Rautila fails to disclose anything about an input/output controller configured to access a server. The Office Action is using

impermissible hindsight by using the claims of the present invention as a road map to improperly combine the references. See Ex parte Clapp, 227 U.S.P.Q. 972, 973 (Bd. App. 1985); M.P.E.P. §2144. This is another reason why claim 1 is allowable over the cited combination.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over the cited combinations. Claims 2-18 have been canceled solely to further the prosecution of the application. The rejections should be withdrawn and claim 1 allowed.

With respect to the newly added claims, the information input/output system according to claim 19 includes a data storage unit configured to store data, a server connected to the data storage unit and configured to store a plurality of authentication codes related to a plurality of users, and a controller connected to the server. According to claim 19, "the controller is configured to receive an authentication code related to a user, and to transmit the authentication code to the server." The "server is configured to allow the controller to access the data in the data storage unit, and output the data accessed, when the authentication code received coincides with one of the plurality of authentication codes stored in the server." Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, even when considered in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least the above underlined limitations. Claims 20-26 depend from claim 19 and are allowable along with claim 19 for at least the reasons set forth above and on their own merits.

The information input/output system according to claim 27 includes a data storage unit configured to store data, a server connected to the data storage unit and configured to store a plurality of authentication codes related to a plurality of users, a controller connected to the server, and "a mobile communication terminal configured

to receive an authentication code related to a user of the mobile communication terminal and to transmit the authentication code received to the controller." The data storage unit is configured to transmit the data to the mobile communication terminal. According to claim 27, the controller is configured "to receive the authentication code from the mobile communication terminal, and to transmit the authentication code received to the server." The "server is configured to allow the controller to output the data received by the mobile communication terminal" and perform money charging corresponding to the output of the data, "when the authentication code received coincides with one of the plurality of authentication codes stored in the server." Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, even when considered in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least the above underlined limitations. Claims 28-32 depend from claim 27 and are allowable along with claim 27 for at least the reasons set forth above and on their own merits.

The server according to claim 33 includes means for receiving data corresponding to a data output process requested by a user, means for storing the data received, "means for issuing the user a code corresponding to the data output process and for notifying the user of the code; and means for transmitting the stored data to the user when the code is entered by the user." The input/output controller according to claim 34 includes "a first interface configured to receive from a user a code corresponding to a data output process requested by the user, a second interface configured to receive, from a server, data which has been stored in the server, the data corresponding to the code," and a third interface configured to output the data via an output device. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, even when considered in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least the above underlined limitations.

The input-output control method of claim 35 comprises the steps of receiving data corresponding to a data output process requested by a user; storing the data received; "issuing the user a code corresponding to the data output process; notifying the user of the code; and transmitting the stored data to the user when the code is entered by the user." The input/output control method of claim 36 comprising the steps of "receiving, from a user, a code corresponding to a data output process requested by the user; receiving, from a server, data which has been stored in the server, the data corresponding to the code;" and outputting the data via an output device. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, even when considered in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least the above underlined limitations.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: May 3, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Gianni Minutoli

Registration No.: 41,198

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicant